

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/563,181	04/24/2006	Milan Lampic-Oplander	20496-503	3787
21890 7590 11/20/2007 PROSKAUER ROSE LLP PATENT DEPARTMENT			EXAMINER	
			YEE, DEBORAH	
1585 BROADV NEW YORK, N		•	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1793	
•			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/20/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

•		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Summary		10/563,181	MILIAN LAMPIC-OPLANDER		
		Examiner	Art Unit		
		Deborah Yee	1793		
D	The MAILING DATE of this communication app	pears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address		
Period fo	• •	V 10 05T TO EVOIDE . A	AONTHAN OF THEFTY (20) FAVO		
WHIC - Exte - after - If NC - Failu Any	IORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DEPRISON OF STATE OF THE MAILING DEPRISON OF STATE OF THE MAILING DEPRISON OF STATE OF THE MAILING DEPRISON OF THE MAILING DEPRISON OF THE MAILING	ATE OF THIS COMMUNI 136(a). In no event, however, may a will apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI e, cause the application to become A	CATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status					
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on				
2a) <u></u> ☐	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This	is action is non-final.			
3)[Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is				
	closed in accordance with the practice under be	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.E). 11, 453 O.G. 213.		
Disposit	ion of Claims				
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application				
,—	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra				
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.				
6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-19</u> is/are rejected.				
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.				
8)[Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.			
Applicat	ion Papers				
9)[]	The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.			
•	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc		by the Examiner.		
-	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyar	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).		
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	tion is required if the drawing	g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	kaminer. Note the attached	d Office Action or form PTO-152.		
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
_	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C.	\$ 119(a)-(d) or (f).		
	⊠ All b) Some * c) None of:	, p	3 (.) (.)		
,	1. Certified copies of the priority document	s have been received.			
	2. Certified copies of the priority document	s have been received in A	application No		
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the prio	rity documents have been	received in this National Stage		
	application from the International Bureau	u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).			
* 5	See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not	received.		
			·		
Attachmen			•		
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date		
	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)		nformal Patent Application		
	er No(s)/Mail Date <u>12-30-05</u> .	6) Other:	<u>_</u> .		

Application/Control Number:

10/563,181 Art Unit: 1793

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 2. Claims 1 and 8 to 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
- 3. The Sc equation is not clearly defined. It is recommended to add an additional parenthesis such that equation recites ---- Sc = C% / (4.26 0.3* (Si% + P%)) -----.
- 4. Claims 8 to 19 are improper multiple dependent claims. Note a multiple dependent claim cannot depend on another multiple dependent claim. Correction required.
- 5. The recitation "type of oxide" in claim 19 is indefinite. Note that the addition to the word "type" to an otherwise definite expression is held to be indefinite because it is unclear what "type" was intended to convey. See MPEP 2173.05©.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Application/Control Number:

10/563,181 Art Unit: 1793

- Claims 1 to 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over European patent 1004789 (hereinafter EP'789) or European patent 1213071 (hereinafter EP'071) cited by Applicant in IDS dated December 30, 2005 in view of Japanese patent 52-111814, US Patent 6,177,045 (hereinafter Ecob et al.) or Soviet Union patent 1803460 (SU'460) and Derwent publication of NL 150847- English abstract.
- 8. The abstract of EP'789 or EP'071 discloses a gray cast iron alloy having a composition with constituents whose wt% ranges overlap those recited by the claims; such overlap in wt% ranges establishes a prima facie case of obviousness since it would obvious for one skilled in the art to select the claimed alloy wt% ranges over the broader disclosure of the prior art because the prior art teaches the same utility (making camshaft).
- 9. More specifically EP'071 on line 35 on page 7 discloses a cast iron alloy which closely meets the claimed composition except for 0.29% Mn. It would be obvious, however, to increase Mn since a broad Mn range of up to 1.0% is taught. Also when calculated, Sc and MEG equation limitations are met. Similarly, EP'789 in column 1 of the table on pages 3 and 4 discloses a cast iron alloy example that closely meets the claimed composition and when calculated, Sc and MEG equation limitations are met.
- 10. Even though 0.003 to 0.007% oxygen as recited by the claims is not taught by prior art, such would not be a patentable difference. Note that it is well known in the art to add small amounts of oxygen to grey cast iron to promote high graphitization tendency and high impact toughness, as taught by the English abstract of JP'814. Since

10/563,181 Art Unit: 1793

such properties would be desired and sought by EP'789 or EP'071, then it would be an obvious modification well within the skill of the artisan to incorporate small amounts of oxygen to its cast iron alloy to produce no more than the known and expected effects from such an addition.

- 11. Even though adding a small amount of Sr, Ni, N or Ce as recited by the claims is not taught by prior art, such would not be a patentable difference. Note that it is well known in the art that Sr, Ni, N or Ce are conventionally added to grey cast iron to further enhance mechanical properties, as evident by Ecob et al, SU'460 and NL English abstract; and hence would be a matter of choice and routine optimization well within the skill of the artisan to incorporate to produce no new and unexpected results.
- 12. The prior art does not teach iron alloy in the cast state containing more than 50% of oxygen in the form of oxide as recited as recited by claim 19 but such oxide formation would be expected since compositional limitations are closely met and in absence of proof to the contrary.
- 13. The prior art teaches alloying elements that overlap or closely suggest those recited by one or more of the dependent claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Deborah Yee whose telephone number is 571-272-1253. The examiner can normally be reached on monday-friday 6:00 am-2:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy King can be reached on 571-272-1244. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number:

10/563,181 Art Unit: 1793

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Deborah Yee/ Primary Examiner Art Unit 1793

/DY/